

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/821,491	04/09/2004	Sergei Drizlikh	P05842	P05842 1426	
23990	7590 12/15/2005		EXAMINER		
DOCKET CLERK			GURLEY, LYNNE ANN		
P.O. DRAWE DALLAS, TX			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,,			2812		
			DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/821,491		DRIZLIKH ET AL.	
		Examiner	· ,	Art Unit	
		Lynne A. Gur	ley	2812	
The MAILING DA Period for Reply	TE of this communication ap	opears on the co	over sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
WHICHEVER IS LONG  - Extensions of time may be ave after SIX (6) MONTHS from th  - If NO period for reply is specifi - Failure to reply within the set of	UTORY PERIOD FOR REPL ER, FROM THE MAILING D ilable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. e mailing date of this communication. ed above, the maximum statutory period r extended period for reply will, by statut e later than three months after the mailing. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS .136(a). In no event, d will apply and will ex te, cause the applicat	COMMUNICATION however, may a reply be tirr spire SIX (6) MONTHS from ion to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status					
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FIN</b> 3)□ Since this applica	mmunication(s) filed on <u>03 (</u> <b>AL</b> . 2b) ☐ Thing tion is in condition for allowed and the practice under th	is action is non- ance except for	formal matters, pro		nerits is
Disposition of Claims					
4a) Of the above of 5) ☐ Claim(s) is 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-4 and</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s) is	21-36 is/are rejected.	awn from consi			
Application Papers					
10) The drawing(s) file Applicant may not r Replacement drawi	s objected to by the Examine of on is/are: a) accepted any objection to the ong sheet(s) including the correctation is objected to by the Examine.	cepted or b)  e drawing(s) be he ction is required i	eld in abeyance. Seef the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFF	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119				
a) All b) Some  1. Certified co  2. Certified co  3. Copies of the	s made of a claim for foreign  e * c) None of:  pies of the priority document  pies of the priority document  ne certified copies of the priof  from the International Burea	its have been roots have been roots	eceived. eceived in Applications have been receive	on No	tage
* See the attached d	etailed Office action for a list	t of the certified	copies not receive	d.	0
Attachment(s)  1)  Notice of References Cited	(PTO-892)	4)	PRIM. To	YNNE A. GURLEY ARY PATENT EXAM C 2800, AU 2812 (PTO-413)	INER
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Par	ent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ment(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) 5)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da  Notice of Informal Pa		52)

Art Unit: 2812

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office Action is in response to the amendment with remarks, filed 10/3/05.

Currently, claims 1-4 and new claims 21-36 are pending. Claims 5-20 have been canceled.

## Specification

1. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claim1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mueller et al. (US 5,427,666, dated 6/27/95).

Mueller shows the method as claimed in figure 3B and corresponding text, with TiN (ARC) 58 and Ti layer 60, which protects the layer 58 from contaminants. Nitrogen plasma is used to form the TiN.

Application/Control Number: 10/821,491 Page 3

Art Unit: 2812

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 7. Claims 2-4 and 21-36 (new) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller et al. (US 5, 427,666, dated 6/27/95) in view of Ting et al. (US 6,399,508, dated 6/4/02).

Mueller shows the method substantially as claimed and as described in the previous paragraphs.

Mueller lacks anticipation only in not teaching: that the contaminant may be fluorine and that the application of the nitrogen plasma increases a temperature of the semiconductor device to approx. 400 degrees C; placing a dielectric layer over the layer of anti-reflective coating (ARC) titanium nitride and the fabrication of the via passage by depositing a dielectric layer over a TiN ARC layer, performing a mask and etch procedure to etch through the layer of TiN anti-reflective coating (ARC).

Ting teaches etching of Ti and TiN in a fluorine atmosphere to pattern the layers. Ting also teaches the use of a dielectric layer 140 to pattern the ARC layer 130. Additionally, Ting teaches the fabrication of the via passage by depositing a dielectric layer over a TiN ARC layer, performing a mask and etch procedure to etch through the layer of TiN anti-reflective coating (ARC).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art that the Ti layer over the TiN ARC, as taught in Mueller, would protect the TiN layer from the damage caused by subsequent patterning using fluorine, with the motivation that the Ti layer would act as a barrier to the fluorine atoms.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have increased a temperature of the semiconductor device to approx. 400 degrees C by the application of the nitrogen plasma, in the method of Muealler, with the motivation that the plasma nitridation process may be performed conventionally while heating the substrate to such a temperature.

Art Unit: 2812

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have fabricated the via passage by depositing a dielectric layer over a TiN ARC layer, performing a mask and etch procedure to etch through the layer of TiN anti-reflective coating (ARC), in the method of Mueller, as taught by the method of Ting, with the motivation that this patterning process would allow the via to be accurately patterned and a contact to be made to the underlying metal.

#### Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 10/8/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to Applicant's remarks, the prior art shows the method as described in the preceding paragraphs. Applicant's claimed invention does not preclude the contaminant being TiN or, any other element in the broadest interpretation. Contaminants are constantly present in semiconductor processing. The layer 60 acts to prevent contamination in a physical sense from any external elements. The application of nitrogen plasma to the layer of titanium in its broadest interpretation includes the deposition process to form the TiN layer 58. All that is called for is applying nitrogen plasma to the layer of titanium.

#### Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 2812

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lynne A. Gurley whose telephone number is 571-272-1670. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Lebentritt can be reached on 571-272-1873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lynne A. Gurley

**Primary Patent Examiner** 

Art Unit 2812

LAG

December 12, 2005